REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 31, and 35-79 are pending and stand rejected. In view of the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner and her supervisor Etienne LeRoux for their time in conducting a telephone interview on June 9, 2009 with Applicants' representative Robert R. Sachs and Matthew Harvey. During the telephone interview, Applicants' representative, the Examiner, and Mr. LeRoux discussed Rouse (U.S. Patent 6,983,310) and the claim language of independent claims 1, 42, and 61. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the outstanding rejections in view of the arguments included herein.

Response to Rejections Under 35 USC 102(e) and 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 31, and 35-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Rouse (U.S. Patent 6,983,310). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as applied to the amended claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for capturing event data associated with a plurality of different types of articles, the articles comprising article data generated by a plurality of different client applications, the method comprising:

> storing a plurality of different event schemas, each event schema associated with at least one of the types of articles and defining a format for storing event data, **wherein event data represents user interactions with articles and is distinct from article data**;

detecting an event, the event including a user interaction with an article;

responsive to the event, determining an event schema associated with the type of the article; and

storing, in a data store, event data that identifies the event and identifies the article using the format defined by the event schema associated with the type of the article.

Rouse does not disclose or suggest at least the claimed features of, "storing a plurality of different event schemas, each event schema … defining a format for storing event data, wherein event data represents user interactions with articles and is distinct from article data" or "storing … event data that identifies [an] event and identifies [an] article using the format defined by the event schema associated with the type of the article."

Fundamentally, Rouse is not directed towards the storage of event data that "represents user interactions with articles and is distinct from article data." Rather, Rouse is concerned with enabling a user of a mobile device to remotely search and access server-based information over a wireless network. *See* Rouse, FIG. 1, Abstract, and col. 1, line 64 – col. 2, line 12. Rouse mentions storing various type of information, but at best merely discloses storage of article data and various user preferences. *See* Rouse, col. 5, lines 35-37; col. 11, lines 18-21; and col. 6, lines 37-42. Accordingly, Rouse's searches are solely over article data. For example, Rouse describes "searching messages based on … parts of a message." *See* Rouse, col. 2, lines 13-18. Rouse does not suggest, let alone hint at, searching based on event data that "represents user interactions with articles and is distinct from article data," because Rouse does not store such event data.

As Rouse is unrelated to the storage of event data that "represents user interactions with articles and is distinct from article data," it follows that Rouse does not suggest either the claimed storing of event schemas that define a format for storing such event data or the claimed

storing of event data using a format defined by such an event schema. The Examiner has pointed to several modules included in Rouse as disclosing the claimed event schemas, but these modules do not do what the Examiner suggests. *See* Office Action, pages 2-3. Rather than comprising event schemas as claimed, the modules described by Rouse are merely conventional software application modules such as an e-mail module, a calendar module, a search module, etc. *See* Rouse, FIG. 4 and col. 7, lines 50-58. Rouse discloses nothing to suggest that the cited modules are in any way related to the storage of event data "wherein event data represents user interactions with articles and is distinct from article data," much less that the cited modules define a format for storing event data wherein event data represents user interactions with articles and is distinct from article data. Whether discussing the modules of FIG. 4 or otherwise, Rouse does not disclose or suggest event schemas as claimed.

For at least the above-described reasons, Rouse fails to disclose or suggest at least the claimed features of "storing a plurality of different event schemas, each event schema … defining a format for storing event data, wherein event data represents user interactions with articles and is distinct from article data" and "storing … event data that identifies [an] event and identifies [an] article using the format defined by the event schema associated with the type of the article."

Independent claims 42 and 61 recite similar features as those recited in claim 1. Hence, based on the arguments advanced above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 42, and 61 are also patentably distinguishable over Rouse and request their allowance. The dependent claims incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney if it would be beneficial to further advance the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

MIHAI FLORIN IONESCU ET AL.

Dated: June 30, 2009

By: /Robert R. Sachs/

Robert R. Sachs, Reg. No. 42,120
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2410
Fax: (415) 281-1350
Email: rsachs@fenwick.com